J669RICS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 17 CR 684 (ER) v. 5 EMANUEL RICHARDSON, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. June 6, 2019 9 11:02 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. EDGARDO RAMOS 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York NOAH D. SOLOWIEJCZYK 17 ROBERT L. BOONE ELI J. MARK 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 MORDOCK BARBER LLC Attorney for Defendant 20 CRAIG J. MORDOCK 21 22 23 24 25

1 (Case called) 2 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Good morning, your Honor. Noah Solowiejczyk, Robert Boone and Eli Mark for the 3 4 government. 5 THE COURT: Good morning. 6 MR. MORDOCK: Good morning, your Honor. 7 Craig Mordock on behalf of Emanuel Book Richardson. Mr. Richardson is present in the court. 8 9 THE COURT: Good morning to you both. 10 This matter is on for sentencing and in preparation 11 for today's proceedings I have reviewed the following. I have 12 reviewed the presentence report last revised on April 12, 2019 13 prepared by U.S. probation officer Stephanie McMahon which 14 includes a recommendation. 15 I've also reviewed the sentencing letters submitted by Mr. Moore filed May 20, 2019 which includes letters by several 16 17 of Mr. Richardson's friends. And I have reviewed the government's submission dated 18 May 31, 2019 which includes the victim-impact statement 19 20 submitted by the general counsel of the University of Arizona. 21 Is there anything else that I should have received or 22 reviewed? 23 Mr. Solowiejczyk.

24

25

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Not from the government. I believe Mr. Mordock has one additional letter.

1 THE COURT: OK. Mr. Mordock.

MR. MORDOCK: Your Honor, I have one letter from Mr. Richardson's wife. I'd like the Court to review it in consideration of sentence.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

Has the government already seen it?

MR. MORDOCK: Yes, your Honor.

(Pause)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, there is one matter we wanted to take up before the sentencing began in earnest. In reviewing the transcript of the plea proceedings in preparation for sentencing — I have discussed this with Mr. Mordock — we do believe that there was at least one aspect of the allocution that was lacking and I believe Mr. Richardson is prepared to make a brief additional statement at this time.

THE COURT: Very well.

Mr. Mordock.

MR. MORDOCK: Yes, your Honor.

Mr. Richardson is prepared to make a statement just to clarify what was in the allocution. I believe he may have, while he was reading, forgot a sentence. And he's prepared to do that today in terms of stating the facts under 18 U.S.C. 666.

THE COURT: OK. Is he just going to read that one sentence?

MR. MORDOCK: However the Court -- I don't know how the Court would need it for the transcript.

THE COURT: How long is the entire statement?

MR. MORDOCK: It was just really a line that needs to be corrected, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well I mean just so that I understand what's missing, what is --

MR. MORDOCK: Go ahead.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: I can give some context if that's helpful.

THE COURT: Please.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Mr. Richardson in his prior allocution, which I'm happy to provide a copy to the Court, he talked about setting up meetings for Mr. Dawkins. He talked about — but he didn't really talk about the fact that he was receiving money in exchange for doing that. That was the thing that was missing. That was the statement that Mr. Richardson was going to make here today.

THE COURT: Very well.

Mr. Richardson.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor. Just wanted to let the Court -- let the government know I accepted money for arranging meetings with student athletes.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Solowiejczyk do you wish me to make any further inquiry?

1	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Who he set the meetings up for.
2	THE COURT: For whom did you set up the meetings,
3	Mr. Richardson?
4	THE DEFENDANT: With student athletes.
5	THE COURT: For whom? At whose behest?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me. I set up meetings with
7	student athletes for Christian Dawkins.
8	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We're satisfied, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Very well.
10	Thank you, Mr. Richardson.
11	Mr. Mordock have you read the presentence report and
12	discussed it with your client?
13	MR. MORDOCK: I have, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Richardson, have you received a copy
15	of the presentence report and discussed it with your attorney?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Are there any objections to the report
18	regarding its factual accuracy?
19	MR. MORDOCK: No, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Very well. Although I am not required to
21	impose a sentence within the applicable guidelines range, I am
22	required to consider the range in imposing sentence and,
23	accordingly, I need to do the calculation.
24	Mr. Richardson pleaded guilty to Count One of the
25	indictment which charges him with conspiracy to commit bribery

in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 371. That offense carries a base offense level of 12, to which two levels are added because Mr. Richardson received more than one bribe, and an additional four levels are added because the approximate total of the bribes that he received was \$20,000. Three levels are deducted for Mr. Richardson's acceptance of responsibility, yielding a total offense level of 15.

Because Mr. Richardson has no prior convictions he is in criminal history category I.

Are there any objections to that calculation, Mr. Solowiejczyk?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mordock?

MR. MORDOCK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Based on the parties' representations that they agree with the calculation, the same calculation that's set forth in the presentence report, I accept the calculation in the presentence report and find that Mr. Richardson is in criminal history category I and that the total offense level is 15, yielding a guidelines range of 18 to 24 months.

Mr. Solowiejczyk, does the government wish to be heard before the imposition of sentence?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Briefly, your Honor.

I'm not going to go over everything that was in our

papers. Just very briefly. I think your Honor is aware that this conduct was serious and had serious consequences for Mr. Richardson's university, the University of Arizona. Those consequences included some things that have already happened, some things that are still to come. The things that have already happened included student athletes de-committing from the university, harm to the reputation to the school. What's still to come and is, in the University of Arizona's victim-impact statement, is the NCAA has now begun an investigation in earnest and it's very likely there will ultimately be penalties and sanctions imposed on the university. That's one aspect of the harm that was caused here.

THE COURT: Do you know that for a fact that the NCAA has, in fact, commenced an investigation of the University of Arizona?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Based on the letter from the University of Arizona that's our understanding, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: The conduct here, though, is serious in another respect and that is there are really two ways that the student athletes were impacted by what Mr. Richardson did. The first is -- I don't think this can be overstated. What Mr. Richardson was ultimately agreeing to do was take money secretly and in exchange for that steer the

student athletes that trusted him, that he had influence over, to sign with Christian Dawkins and his new company. The student athletes did not know Mr. Richardson was taking money for that purpose. And the reality is Mr. Richardson wasn't recommending Mr. Dawkins because this was what was in the best interests of these kids; it's because he was taking secret bribes. And that's really, at the end of the day, significant conduct that took advantage of student athletes. And Mr. Richardson, his job was actually to look after them. He was doing the opposite here.

The other thing I would note, and we noted this in our submission. Mr. Richardson has taken the position in his sentencing submission that even though he said that a lot of this money was going to go to the families and handlers of student athletes, that really he kept the money for himself. And in some ways that makes Mr. Richardson's conduct more egregious because it means he was willing to basically use the kids that he was coaching as assets in order to try to profit for himself unbeknownst to these student athletes.

And from the standpoint of what kind of risk were the student athletes put at, well, you know, a coach saying I'm giving money to the family of a student athlete, the mere fact the coach is saying that puts these student athletes in jeopardy with respect to their eligibility. I do think that that's a serious aspect of the conduct here.

A couple other factors that your Honor may want to consider. These are things that in some ways separate

Mr. Richardson from perhaps some of the other coaches that your Honor is going to be sentencing or has sentenced.

Mr. Richardson had an agreement with Dawkins and his new company to receive \$5,000 a month. And this was an ongoing agreement. The only reason he didn't continue to receive that money is because he was arrested in September 2017. After he received the first five thousand dollar payment in late

June 2017, Mr. Richardson initiated the next payment. Very soon after he came back to Dawkins and said I need another \$15,000 lump sum payment because I need to use it to recruit a student athlete to attend Arizona. It was Richardson initiating that and that's an important distinction in the government's mind.

To get that money, Mr. Richardson traveled to

New Jersey to the offices of Munish Sood to pick up the money.

They didn't come to him. He went to them. As your Honor saw during the trial, there are numerous conversations where

Mr. Richardson talked about the ways in which he was going to steer and influence the players that he coached to sign with Dawkins and his new company.

The last thing I would say, your Honor, is

Mr. Richardson -- it wasn't all talk. Later on in August

Dawkins, Sood and an FBI undercover agent went to Arizona, met

with Richardson, and then, as facilitated by Richardson, met with the cousin of a current student athlete on the Arizona basketball team. And when the FBI undercover said to

Mr. Richardson, in some and substance, thank you — thank you for setting up the meeting; he said in response to that, I did my job.

And, your Honor, that says a lot about the nature of the quid pro quo relationship here. During the meeting with the cousin, the handler, in sum and substance, that cousin indicated that Mr. Richardson had recommended Dawkins and his company to the Arizona player. So there was real action taken as a result of this money at the end of the day.

When you take that in its totality, it's a serious course of conduct.

The government is happy to address other relevant sentencing factors including general deterrence but I think something your Honor really does need to take into account in fashioning an appropriate sentence is the various ways that — this wasn't one mistake. This wasn't one bad decision. This was multiple times and multiple occasions Richardson consciously deciding for his own greed and his own personal profit to continue down this course.

THE COURT: When the does the government believe that Mr. Richardson first had contact with the coconspirators here?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: He had known Mr. Dawkins for quite

some time, probably for a period of years, is the government's understanding. His first contact with Munish Sood was in around March 2017 in Las Vegas. They had an initial meeting that was set up by Dawkins. Then they spoke by phone again.

But the contact in terms of Richardson starting to agree to work with Dawkins and his new company really starts probably around April 2017 -- May 2017 and on, I would say, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Mordock, is there anything that you wanted to say?
MR. MORDOCK: Your Honor, yes.

Mr. Richardson sits here today, and after I'm done he's going to get up and express remorse and regret. He's expressed remorse and regret throughout this entire process to me, to his family, to the Court when he pled guilty in January. He's going to do so again today.

That he has taken responsibility for his actions and in this matter he has wound up losing everything. He has not had a job since January of 2018 other than training athletes this spring and young athletes, ages 7 to 14, so not college-age players. And he was doing that for 40, 50 dollars an hour.

He is the public face of this scandal. He is the highest profile assistant coach at the highest profile school. Any time this scandal is addressed, Mr. Richardson's picture is

on the front page of the paper or the internet website that that runs the story.

Mr. Richardson has a story. His own personal story begins long before the actions and events of 2017. His story is truly a rags to riches back to rags story in this case in a professional sense, your Honor. Not a monetary sense. He grew up in the city. He was the product of a single mother who did not necessarily have the right set of skills to raise him and provide stability. He spent his high school years sleeping on couches of friends and relatives while there was crime going on, violent crime going on outside.

He gravitated to basketball to provide that stability. He took advantage — basketball provided him with opportunities in life that were not going to be present for other people in his peer group. He took advantage of those opportunities and earned a business degree from Pitt-Johnstown. He worked in banking for two years and decided his real passion in life was coaching and his real passion in life was helping young kids. He quit his job in banking and started working as a substitute teacher in New York City and coaching youth basketball, 7th and 8th graders. This was an entry level job. He didn't do it for the money. He did it because he loved the sport of basketball, because he was good at the sport of basketball and he had something to share; that he continues today with the youth who are gravitating to the sport of basketball. He is

providing himself as a father figure to youths that may or may not have that in their life.

Judge, he wound up getting a job in amateur basketball coaching a summer program called the Gauchos. He had three or four Division I prospects who he had mentored and coached and got them from somewhat difficult backgrounds to Division I basketball and to earn a scholarship and eventually some of them in the NBA.

He took an opportunity to coach at Xavier University in Cincinnati. He went — this was his first foray into college athletics. He went there as an assistant coach. And after two years there and some success there he went to the University of Arizona.

University of Arizona, by all counts, is probably one of the top basketball schools or top five basketball schools in the country. They had a very good level of success.

Mr. Richardson, while being the highest profile coach in this conspiracy, he also was the lowest paid coach in this conspiracy. And that factor and those pressures -- and I know your Honor has read the impact statement from the University of Arizona. That's what has led to him being involved in this situation.

He was experiencing tremendous financial pressure in the spring of 2017. And I do want -- I do think it should be made clear that the -- this conspiracy started with a man named

Marty Blazer, who I know your Honor heard from during the testimony, who stole \$2 million from clients. And he's looking for leniency. And he creates this conspiracy.

Christian Dawkins -- Christian Dawkins on behalf of Marty Blazer and the government approaches Mr. Richardson.

Mr. Richardson was not out there soliciting money. OK. And I know your Honor has heard the conversations. Christian Dawkins was coaching Mr. Richardson on what to say. Mr. Richardson was offering Christian Dawkins an opportunity and Christian said no, I don't need the money, you keep it, take your wife shopping. And I think this is really important as well. And this goes to show you Mr. Richardson's regret and remorse in this scandal.

He never did give the money to the players. And I realize there are two sides of the same coin. But Mr. Richardson's thought process was he did not want to endanger their eligibility. He did not want to risk this.

And how do we know that these players didn't get the money? Well the University of Arizona says so. They conducted an investigation. The player that was mentioned played the entire 2017, 2018 season for the University of Arizona. They would not risk his eligibility or their season if they thought he had received the money.

The other player went to the university -- went to Villanova University. Villanova University, by all counts,

runs a squeaky clean program. They've won two national championships in the last three years. And, Judge,
Mr. Richardson and myself helped Villanova University ascertain the facts and circumstances of what happened. He was trying to make this right. And he made it clear to the University of Villanova that he did not give Mr. Quinerly or Mr. Quinerly's family any money. Mr. Cornily played basketball this season for the University of Villanova. He was eligible. He played the entire 2018/2019 season. I can assure the Court that if there was any risk of him being ineligible, them forfeiting games, he would not have been on the court for them.

THE COURT: It's fortunate that they were not -- that they were eligible to play. But are you suggesting that Mr. Richardson kept the bribe money in order to protect the players?

MR. MORDOCK: I'm suggesting that he had some regret and remorse even at that point in the scandal for being involved in this, that he was trying to lookout for -- he was trying to lookout for his players while also enriching himself.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. MORDOCK: Judge, so that addresses

Mr. Richardson's role in the offense. And I guess what I would
talk to you a little bit about, in consideration of the 3553
factors as well, is the sentencing disparities among similarly
situated defendants. And, Judge, the prosecution has pointed

out that Merl Code may, in fact, be less culpable than Mr. Richardson. Well Mr. Code's sentencing range was I believe 24 to 30 months, less than Mr. Richardson's range. Mr. Code has never expressed any regret, remorse, has never admitted responsibility. He's gone to trial twice on this. And Judge Kaplan decided to sentence him to six months incarceration. So in this case the government's position is that Mr. Richardson, even though he accepted responsibility, now should do three times the amount of time that a defendant who did not accept responsibility took.

The other thing with similarly situated defendants.

As your Honor knows, Mr. Bland was here yesterday. Your Honor sentenced him to probation.

Mr. Richardson and Mr. Bland have very similar life stories. They grew up without fathers. They got to the highest points of their profession. They made a mistake and they are paying the price for it. They will never work in basketball again. And they are regretful. And Mr. Richardson shares the same remorse and regret that Mr. Bland does.

Now Mr. Bland's sentencing guideline was lower because the amount of loss was only \$4,000. As your Honor knows in the sentencing guidelines the amount of loss is very compressed at the bottom. So a ten thousand dollar difference means that Mr. Richardson may be looking at 18 to 24 months where, you know, if had been involved in a scandal that had five hundred

thousand or a million dollars, there would be no difference in the sentence. So that's what pushes this up and that's what pushes the guideline. And we feel it makes it more — it makes it greater than — the sentence is greater than necessary under the guidelines.

And I'll just address specific deterrence.

Judge, Mr. Richardson is never going to work in basketball again. Mr. Richardson is very conscious to not be around college athletes. He is working with younger youth players, 7 to 14 years old. He is trying to rebuild his life. And he is always going to have this stain with him.

In terms of general deterrence, your Honor. Prior to September of 2017 I don't believe anybody working in college basketball or amateur sports for that matter believed that an NCAA violation would load to a federal criminal prosecution. If you committed an NCAA violation, no one believed that they were committing a violation of federal law. I think after that and after the publicity of this case everyone is on notice that now if you do so you could be subject to federal prosecution.

Putting Mr. Richardson in jail or giving him a sentence of incarceration, that is greater than necessary to promote general deterrence. Just the fact that he's been through this process and he has lost everything provides a story and a warning sign to the people who work in college athletics that an NCAA violation, depending on severity, could

lead to a federal prosecution.

At this point, your Honor, we would suggest to the Court that based on the 3553 factors and applying them to these facts a sentence of probation is sufficient but not greater than necessary to fulfill the aims of that statute. Thank you.

I believe Mr. Richardson would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: Mr. Richardson you have an absolute right to address the Court. Is there anything that you wanted me to know?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor. I didn't hear you.

THE COURT: Is there anything that you wanted me to know?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Your Honor, as I stand here in front of you today -- I initially wrote some notes down because it meant a lot to me but I'm not going to go through my notes. I'm going to speak from my heart. I'm here asking for forgiveness and leniency.

I want to address the Court and I want to apologize to some very important people in my life, my wife who is here with me. I want to express deep sorrow and apologize for the actions that I made, for the decisions — the decision I made in 2017. There is no excuse for anything that was done and I take full ownership. I take full responsibility. My friends

who I'm -- again, who have come to show support. Your Honor, I'm from New York City. I've lived in every borough except Staten Island. I've been to five elementary schools. My mother had me at fifteen years old. Again, that makes no excuse. I have no rhyme or reason for the decision that was made. I made it.

Your Honor, again, as I express sorrow and I try my best to show respect to this Court, there were three components that's gotten me through this. Pretrial service has been tremendous for me in the State of Arizona dealing with mental health, addressing situations that I've dealt with for a very long time, for my 46 years of existence, trying to figure things out.

I'm sorry to any student athlete who I've humiliated,
embarrassed -- humiliated, embarrassed and put through this. I
apologize.

Your Honor, the second piece has been my former student athletes who have reached out to me, whether they call me uncle or they call me their dad, I feel like I've let them down. And that's been so many of them, for about 20 years, who have showed tremendous support, my former student athletes and my former teammates, who a couple are here with me.

And finally, my family. I would not have made it through these 20 months living in Tucson, Arizona without my family, without my wife being displaced, coming back to New

York City to find a job to try to help us as best we possibly could; to empty out every single thing I've had in my 401K.

And I'd love to apologize to the University of Arizona and President Robbins; never meant to shame them, disrespect them, in the manner that I have.

And, again, wanting to make sure that I apologize to any student athlete who had been affected through this, through my decisions to do what was done and taking full responsibility and ownership and making sure that, as my counsel alluded to, the one thing in the world — or one of the many things in the world that I love, I've had part in making sure that I will probably never coach college basketball again. But I'll always be a coach. I'll always be a mentor. And making a mistake, I'm not sure if there's anyone better served in the world who can express that mistake to anyone who would listen to deter them from doing anything that I did.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Richardson.

In deciding what sentence to impose, in addition to the sentencing guidelines and the commentaries thereto, I have considered all of the factors set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code including the nature and circumstances of the offense and Mr. Richardson's history and characteristics. I have determined the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide a just punishment for the

offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, and to protect the public from further crimes. I've considered the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities amongst similarly situated defendants.

Having considered all of these factors, it is my intention to impose a sentence of three months incarceration, followed by two years of supervised release. I will not impose a fine as I find that Mr. Richardson's current financial situation makes him unable to pay a fine.

I believe that this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in Section 3553(a)(2) for the following reasons.

I begin, as I must, by noting that I do believe that this is a serious crime. It actually went beyond merely violating NCAA rules. It clearly violated the criminal statute that Mr. Richardson pleaded guilty to, including the additional facts that he put on the record today, and it was a crime that was committed by someone who, despite perhaps a difficult childhood, first of all, knew better because he is an educated man, an intelligent man, but a man who didn't need to do this. Mr. Richardson was able to live out his dream of coaching some of the finest athletes in the country, at one of the finest universities, in one of the finest basketball programs in the country. I have no doubt that there were financial

difficulties that he was experiencing, although by all accounts he was earning certainly a living wage in Arizona and did not need to go this route, but go this route he did. He engaged in this activity not on a one-off. It wasn't a one-day decision. It wasn't a one-time only thing. It took place over several months. And as the government pointed out, at one point it was Mr. Richardson himself that initiated the payment of a bribe.

His conduct also had real victims. I do believe that the institution of the University of Arizona has been victimized by his conduct. The letter that was submitted by the general counsel talks about the loss of reputation of the institution that it had built up so carefully over many years. In fact, Mr. Richardson was part of that effort. It caused several student athletes to de-commit to the university. And, obviously, there are additional legal costs that they have to endure and now, in all likelihood, an NCAA investigation which may lead to some additional adverse consequences for the university.

More importantly, from the standpoint of the Court, the students — the student athletes that Mr. Richardson coached and mentored I believe were also victimized. I reread some of the telephone calls involving Mr. Richardson in preparation for today's sentencing and he clearly, on any number of occasions, told Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Sood and the government cooperators or the government undercovers that he

would, in fact, be delivering those students to Mr. Dawkins. And he took money for that. So he clearly put himself ahead of those students and their financial well-being in carrying out these acts. And the students, although they have not been determined to be ineligible, did carry the possibility of — they were exposed to the possibility that they would not be able to compete at the college level. Now, I don't know what that means necessarily in terms of their future ability to play in the NBA but that's a very real exposure to harm that Mr. Richardson put those students through.

I do not believe that specific deterrence is a major factor with respect to Mr. Richardson. I don't believe that I will ever see him again in this courtroom. I don't believe that he will reoffend, nor do I believe that he will violate the conditions of supervised release.

And I think that general deterrence is also not an overwhelming or not terribly weighty factor in connection with his sentence. As I indicated yesterday, the universe of individuals who engage — who are college coaches is fairly limited. I think that this case certainly has gotten a lot of publicity and I think people have gotten the message both through these related prosecutions and the more recent Varsity Blues investigation being handled out of the District of Massachusetts, that people have become very well aware, if they weren't aware before, as to Mr. Mordock's point, that engaging

in this type of activity and taking money corruptly in connection with the business of these institutions can result in very serious consequences.

However, I do not believe that -- I do believe that punishment in this case is important because of the very serious actions that Mr. Richardson engaged in. And that is why I do believe that some period of incarceration is necessary.

Mention was made of Mr. Bland and my sentence of him yesterday to probation. I do believe that these individuals, Mr. Richardson and Mr. Bland, are different in connection with their involvement and their levels of culpability in this case. And it's not just the fact that Mr. Bland took substantially less money that Mr. Richardson. It was Mr. Richardson's involvement and initiation of the receipt of bribes over a period of months.

However, I do not believe that a sentence certainly as much as the guidelines would require, which is 18 months at the bottom, is necessary. And because we already know what the sentence will be for certain of the codefendants in this case, namely Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Code, that -- and I do find that Mr. Richardson is less culpable than they. I do think that a sentence of three months is appropriate both for all the reasons that I just discussed and also because I read very carefully the letters that were submitted, the submissions by

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Mordock, and I have no doubt that the picture of Mr. Richardson that was provided to me by his friends is real. I do believe that he is by and large a very good person who has done a lot of good over the course of his life. I have no doubt that he has positively impacted the lives of dozens, if not hundreds, of young men over the course of his career and young men of color who, like him, perhaps had difficult childhoods and overcame a lot of adversity in order to be able to compete at that very high level. I'm sure that having someone like Mr. Richardson at the University of Arizona made it much, much easier for them to navigate being away from home and being in a college environment and being the center of a lot of attention including attention by individuals like Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Sood and the others. So, I have no doubt that Mr. Richardson played a very important, almost paternal, role in the lives of those individuals. So I do believe that some leniency -- that he merits a great deal of leniency because of the largely good life that he has led.

And so with that, does counsel know of any legal reason other than what has already been stated as to why I should not impose the sentences I've indicated?

Mr. Solowiejczyk.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, we may have missed it but there was also forfeiture in the amount of \$20,000. You may have mentioned the \$100 special assessment.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I have not but I will. 1 2 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: My apologies. THE COURT: I'm not quite done. 3 4 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: No legal reason that sentence can't 5 be imposed. 6 THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Mordock. 7 MR. MORDOCK: Your Honor, there is no legal reason the sentence can't be imposed. 8 9 THE COURT: Very well. In that event, it is the 10 judgment of the Court that Mr. Richardson be sentenced to three 11 months imprisonment on the one count of conviction. 12 The conditions of probation -- the standard conditions 13 of probation one through twelve should apply as well as the 14 following mandatory and special conditions. The mandatory conditions are that you not commit 15 another federal, state, or local crime; 16 17 That you not unlawfully possess a controlled substance; and that you should refrain from the use of a 18 controlled substance and submit to one drug test within fifteen 19 20

days of release and at least two drug tests thereafter as determined by probation.

The special conditions are that you not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule. And you must provide

the probation officer with access to any requested financial information.

I will not impose the special condition that the probation recommends concerning search of your residence.

And if you do live outside of the district it is recommended that you be supervised by the district of residence.

You are ordered to pay the mandatory special assessment of \$100 which shall be due immediately.

As I indicated, I will not impose a fine as I find that Mr. Richardson is not able to pay a fine. And that you are ordered to forfeit \$20,000 to the government as I believe you have already agreed to do.

Are there any open counts concerning Mr. Richardson?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Yes, your Honor. The government

would move to dismiss all open counts at this time.

THE COURT: That application is granted.

That constitutes the sentence of the Court.

Mr. Richardson, I believe that I sentenced you below the stipulated guideline range. In your agreement with the government that means as a practical matter that your appellate rights are severely restricted.

However, Mr. Mordock, will you assure me that you will promptly and thoroughly discuss with Mr. Richardson his appellate rights and the effect of the plea agreement on his

```
appellate rights?
1
 2
               MR. MORDOCK: I will your Honor.
               THE COURT: Mr. Mordock, do you have any other
 3
 4
      applications?
 5
               MR. MORDOCK: No, your Honor.
6
               THE COURT: In that event, we are adjourned. And
 7
     Mr. Richardson, good luck to you, sir.
               MR. MORDOCK: Thank you, Judge.
8
9
               MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, sorry. Did you want to
      set a surrender date at this time?
10
11
               THE COURT: Six weeks?
12
               MR. MORDOCK: Yes, your Honor. Six weeks is fine.
13
               MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Can we have one moment, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Sure.
15
               (Counsel confer)
               Mr. Mordock, one other thing. If he's not designated
16
17
      within six weeks you can make application to enlarge that so he
      can self-surrender.
18
19
               MR. MORDOCK: Yes, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Ms. Rivera.
21
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: July 18, 2019.
22
               THE COURT: Anything else?
23
               MR. MORDOCK: That would be it.
24
               THE COURT: We're adjourned.
25
               (Adjourned)
```